

740

SPEECH

OF

HON. W. KELLOGG, OF ILLINOIS,

ON THE

GOVERNMENT OF THE TERRITORIES.

AND

DONATION OF LAND TO ACTUAL SETTLERS.

DELIVERED IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, JANUARY 25, 1859.

The House being in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union—
Mr. KELLOGG said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: From the discussion of the last few days, it is apparent that the political parties are preparing for the conflict of 1860. The gentlemen on the other side of the House, who doubtless speak authoritatively for the real unalloyed Democracy, (I mean the Administration Democracy,) have presented as an issue for that campaign—the subjugation of Mexico, Central America, and the acquisition of the Island of Cuba. This proposition is entitled to great merit for its modesty.

It is true that the question of the acquisition of territory has always been a popular one, and, in my judgment, will be when it is a mere question of just and honorable acquisition. But it is no matter of dark destiny, as has been often said; it is but the result of one of the traits of character of the American people.

There is not a farmer or planter in the country but desires to possess his neighbor's farm; not a manufacturer who does not desire to increase the number of his spindles; nor a ship-owner who is not anxious to multiply his tonnage; nor is there a commercial man who does not propose to extend his business relations. This is a leading trait in the American character. Why should we not expect, then, that it should become a trait of character in the policy of the Government, and a popular political issue? Then it is not blind destiny, but the natural inclination of the mind of the great mass of the people. But, sir, the people will not accomplish their object by other than just and honorable means; they will not rob Mexico, nor steal Central America; Cuba cannot be bought, and gentlemen well know it. Conquer it we will not, while it is a dependency of Spain; but should the time come, and I believe it will, when Spain cannot retain it, and it should be about to fall into the hands of other Powers, then, sir, we will reach out our hands and pluck the ripened fruit; but until that occurs, it is worse than useless to talk about its acquisition.

Mr. JENKINS. I want to ask the gentleman from Illinois a civil question. I want to know whether, when the fruit is plucked in the manner he describes, he will vote to admit Cuba into the Union as a slave State?

Mr. KELLOGG. When that question arises, it will afford me great pleasure to answer the gentleman. I say to him now, and to his friends, that I propose, by all constitutional, legal, and honorable means, to prevent the extension of slavery to the Territories.

Mr. JENKINS. I want to know whether the gentleman declines to answer my question now? If he does, I want it to go on the record.

Mr. KELLOGG. The question was, whether I would vote for the admission of Cuba as a slave State? I would use every effort in my power to procure its admission as a free State; but if its acquisition under the circumstances I have mentioned were dependent upon its admission or non-admission, I would not hesitate to admit it even as a slave State. But every honorable effort should be made to secure its becoming a free State, on its introduction into the Union. That, I think, is sufficiently clear and explicit.

Mr. JENKINS. I will trouble the gentleman with one further question.

Mr. KELLOGG. Very well; I will listen to the gentleman.

Mr. JENKINS. The gentleman admits that a case might arise under which he would vote for the admission of a slave State. I want to know whether, in saying so, he speaks for the Republican party?

Mr. KELLOGG. I am happy that the gentleman has asked me that question. I am one of that class of men and Representatives who deny the right of any man under God's sun to speak for me or for the Republican party. I speak as the Representative of the fourth congressional district of the State of Illinois.

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MARSHALL) assures us that the honorable gentlemen from Ohio and Maine are issuing peremptory orders to the Republicans with the air of commanders. Sir, if they are mustering the Republican forces, he is certainly *marshaling* the battalions of Americanism, and that, sir, in a tone and manner that indicates that he expects to be obeyed. He declares no union can be effected between these parties. I was not aware that any effort had been made; I did not know that any one was authorized to treat on that subject. If gentlemen have been looking in that direction, let me advise them to go to the people and ask their consent to the arrangement.

Sir, we had quite enough of trading last winter. Night after night, during the last session, self-styled political leaders and eastern journalists were trading, trading, and chaffing over the Republican vote of Illinois; and on this floor, the gentleman from Massachusetts advised and appealed to our voters to rally around the leaders of our opponents. And when the struggle came, and our prairies were lighted up by the fires of political conflict, we found ourselves compelled to wrestle against the influence of eastern journals, which should have sustained and supported us. But, Mr. Chairman, the voters of Illinois were not to be swerved from their purpose; they nailed their flag to the mast, and, in that hand-to-hand fight, wrested Illinois from the Democracy, and have placed it with reasonable certainty within the ranks of Republican States. We have now enrolled one hundred and twenty-five thousand six hundred good and true Republican voters in Illinois, who will not submit to be led by any man; but when the bugle sounds, declaring the true principles of the Republican party, they will, to a man, be at their posts, there to stand the shock of friend or foe. And, sir, let me say to the gentleman from Kentucky, let his party be careful of political associations, lest it lose its manhood. I would suggest to him that, during the late campaign in Illinois, while stereotyped letters from a prominent Senator of his party were being read at every school-house and other meeting in central Illinois, in favor of Judge Douglas, he, attended by priest and bishop, was making demonstrations for the Catholic vote of the city of Peoria. And, sir, in this manner was fought the hardest political battle of the age.

But I will pass from this to a subject that I more particularly desire to consider at this time.

Mr. Chairman, a few days since I presented to the House a resolution embracing some of the principles that, in my judgment, should characterize our policy in the government of the Territories, and had hoped that I could have procured a vote that would have indicated the sense of the House on that proposition. I have thought, and still think, that the increasing importance of the territorial questions to this Government, entering, as they do, largely into the legislation of each session of Congress, should have secured for it an early consideration, with a view to the adoption of some well-defined course of policy for the government of the Territories in their rapid development into independent sovereign

States, fitted for the companionship of our Confederacy; but objections to its reception have thus far prevented me from obtaining a record of the sentiments of gentlemen on the proposition contained in the resolution offered. I therefore propose to present to the committee, and to the country, some of the changes that, in my judgment, should be made in the policy of the territorial governments.

The first proposition is, that all territorial officers now appointed by the President should be elected by the people of the Territory.

The extension of the elective franchise, and not its restriction, has been the cherished policy of our national and State institutions from their earliest history, and has become more firmly established as time has added confirmation of its justness and propriety; and just in proportion as has the element of free, self-government been developed in our Republic, so has its safeguard and sure support—the voting power of the people—been extended. This is not less noticeable in successive congressional action, in the establishment of territorial governments, than in the changes that have been adopted in that relation in the several States. Early in the history of our Government, when the settlers on the public domain began to show signs of political life, governments were established for their benefit and protection. But little of that government was intrusted to the people to be effected by it; the executive, the legislative, and the judicial powers of these governments were placed solely in the hands of the appointees of the President; and thus were governed the dependencies of a nation whose highest boast was, that the people ordained their own laws, and selected from amongst themselves their rulers; and in the Territories where were being molded new empires under the auspices and guardianship of the nation, no element of self-government was found; their laws were enacted, adjudged, and executed by the Governor and judges appointed by the President, and all of them were subject to removal. In this manner were set on foot all the early territorial governments of the country.

The first departure from this policy was the authorization of the inhabitants of the Northwest Territory, in 1792, to elect members of Assembly, who, together with the Governor and legislative council, should compose the legislative department of the territorial government, whenever there should be five thousand and white male inhabitants, over the age of twenty-one years, in a Territory; thereby requiring at least twenty thousand inhabitants before the people had any voice in the affairs of their own government; and even then but little, as the Governor and Council were appointed by the President, and subject to removal at his pleasure. Here was found the first germ of the elective franchise, in directing the government of the people outside of the States, which has been extended from time to time, until now, the law-making power, save in the veto of the Governor, is within the control of the people; they elect their Territorial Legislature, which is intrusted with all legitimate legislative power, not inconsistent with the Constitution and the organic law, yet subject to the supervisory power of Congress. It is hard to conceive why it always should not have been so; but if there were originally reasons for this restriction of popular rights, they have long since ceased, as is fully proved by congressional action, and the results of a more liberal policy.

Congress having recognized the propriety of placing the law-making power in the hands of the people of the Territory, as a matter of good policy, then, sir, I ask, why not carry out this work of progression, and permit the people to also choose from among themselves their own Governor, judges, and other territorial officers? With what propriety can it be said, that a people sufficiently numerous and worthy to require the ordinary machinery of a republican form of government, and to be intrusted with the law-making power, should not also be intrusted with the selection of officers to adjudge and execute the laws they themselves have made. Sir, I deny the propriety of such a distinction; it is at variance with the very elements of the theory of our institutions, and I maintain that it is our duty as Representatives of the people of the States, to inaugurate territorial governments, when required, for the safety and well-being of the inhabitants that shall, in their principles, effects, and consequences, assimilate as nearly as possible to our independent State governments. Where the

principle of self-government is recognized, and yet remains in the subordinate condition of a territorial government, and while we are molding new governments, of whatever character they may be, for the protection of our own people, it is our highest and most sacred duty to impress upon them the image of true republican institutions, not only in form, but in the essential qualities of their natures, and first among these is the principle of self-government, through the elective franchise.

The propriety of the election by the people of county officers, members of both branches of the Legislature, having been fully conceded by congressional action and the approbation of the people of the nation, it is now only a question of degree or extent to which the people exercise this privilege in the Territories. I assume that any people who may safely be intrusted with the legislative branch of the Government, which is unquestionably the most important department, may, and, in fact, should be intrusted with the other departments, by the election or appointment of the officers thereof. Why may not the voter who selects his representative to fashion and make the laws by which he is to be governed, also select the officers who are to adjudge and execute such laws. Certainly no higher degree of judgment is required in the latter than in the former case. Most clearly, it is more consistent with the theory of our institutions, and the doctrines of a liberal self-government of the people.

Again, sir, the people who now make up the population of the Territories have exercised this right, are familiar with its workings, and are competent to its enjoyment; they have but passed the imaginary boundary of the States, where all these rights were enjoyed as rights and not as privileges; they have elected their own Governors, judges, and all the complement of officers that make up the official corps of an independent State; the system has thus far worked well; they were competent to aid in carrying on the entire machinery of a State government, and will it not seem strange to them when they are told that having emigrated from the State of New York, Illinois, or other States, to the Territory of Kansas or Nebraska, they are not as honest or capable as before their emigration? or will it be said that the higher position and duties of a territorial Governor or judge is above the comprehension of the sturdy settler, who, with the full appreciation of his rights as an American citizen, makes his home on our public domain, under the sanction and at the invitation of the General Government, and there hopes and helps to lay the foundation of republican institutions that shall rival the most favored State in the Confederacy? And sir, to that end I would impose on him the duties of such a work, and not withhold from him the means of its accomplishment. They are capable of electing their own officers, or they are not qualified for self-government.

Then, sir, I propose to extend the elective franchise to the election of all territorial officers, not upon the principle of sovereignty in the Territories, but upon the clearly-defined principle of sovereignty in the Federal Government, to be controlled and carried into effect by the direct action of Congress, or by the territorial government under and by the sanction of Congress, and upon the principle of deputing that power to the people of the Territory as a matter of just and wise policy. And thus would I secure these rights and privileges to the people for their own and the nation's good, and at the same time preserve the harmony of the Government from the erroneous idea of two conflicting sovereignties, one in the people of the Territory, and the other in the Federal Government.

But, sir, while this view of the matter might be a sufficient reason for adopting the policy suggested in the resolution, yet there is another reason that must commend itself to every unprejudiced mind, which is the correction of the monstrous abuses that have crept into the system of executive appointments in the Territories, and which unchecked have driven on boldly over the dearest rights of the people until the country demands a correction of these abuses, and the adoption of some measure that will be a guarantee against them in the future, and secure the curtailment of executive patronage.

The centralization of power is doubtless one of the most dangerous tenden-

cies of our Government, and the most insidious and progressive in its character. It finds firm root and abundant nutriment in the Executive patronage of our Republic; and in proportion as it becomes strong, so in proportion it becomes corrupt. And such has been the increase of that tendency in the territorial appointments, that the people of this nation demand a corrective. And whatever gentlemen may think of this measure, on either side of this House, I tell them there is a just alarm in the minds of the people on this subject, and that they will demand of their Representatives that the elective franchise shall be sustained and extended wherever and whenever it may come in conflict with Executive appointments in the distribution of powers for the purpose of keeping power within the reach of this people, rather than placing it in the hands of an irresponsible Executive. But, sir, this change is not to be made without a struggle. The Executive and the party in power will not willingly give up and abandon one of the darling prerogatives of power—the Executive patronage.

In all Governments the appointing power has been dangerous to liberal institutions and popular rights, and in none more so than in this; and here, as elsewhere, it is fearful and jealous of incroachments. Hence when a proposition was made to extend the voting power in the Territories, the Government organ, the Union of this city, which, doubtless, is a faithful exponent of the views of the Administration, alarmed at so direct a blow from the ballot-box, aimed at the very flower of the prerogatives of the Executive, sounded the alarm, and demanded of the faithful to resist to the uttermost, any relief to the people of the Territories from the power of Executive appointments; and wild with excitement at the mention of a change in the government of the Territories that would abridge the power of the Executive to interfere in the affairs of the people, it howls forth the slanderous cry that no evil has resulted from Executive appointments in the Territories; and in its paroxysm of rage declares our Government an experiment that has heretofore always failed, and, like one conscious of his own guilty deeds, grows pale at the thought of exposure and the demand for reformation.

But, sir, these wailings will be unavailing; their too-soon discovered alarm will make the people more eager to know the extent of the wrongs that have been committed through the agency of the increasing patronage of the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, I propose to read an extract from the Washington Union of December 22, 1858, the day after I proposed to the House the introduction of the resolution before mentioned:

“ABSOLUTE POPULAR GOVERNMENT IN THE TERRITORIES.—A resolution has been offered in the House of Representatives, proposing the enactment of a law referring the appointment of Governors, judges, and other territorial offices to the people of the Territories at the polls. This is the *ne plus ultra* of the theory of squatter sovereignty. Blackstone lays it down that every wise law is the result of the experience of mankind in practical life, and is founded upon some good and sufficient *reason*; and that it follows as a sound principle of legal construction and judicial interpretation, that when the reason of such a law ceases, then the law itself should become defunct, the maxim being, *cessante ratione, cessat et ipsa lex*. It cannot be urged in excuse for such a law as is now proposed, that any evils have resulted from the present mode of appointing the chief officers of the Territories, which demand an abandonment of it; or that the mode of appointment now proposed would correct such evils as do prevail, and would not itself be attended with like or greater evils.

“We cannot imagine a single evil that the proposed mode of appointing territorial officers would avoid, or a single practical advantage that it would accomplish. It lacks the most essential ingredient of every wise law—that of being founded upon sound practical reason. It is the suggestion of mere theory, regardless of experience and reckless of practical consequences. It is the proposition not of statesmanship, but of mere idealism; unless, indeed, it be the cunning artifice of demagogism. It is the quintessence of French Red-Republicanism, not proposed to be introduced into the Government of stable and firmly planted society in old States, where it would be comparatively innocuous; but into new, infant, immature, unstable, and rickety communities, where conservatism exists in no form, and where the sustaining hand of Federal conservatism, stretched out to steady, strengthen, and to save, comes as a godsend.”

It is here boldly declared that the patronage of the Executive has been judiciously bestowed, and no evils have resulted from it which could have been remedied by the people in the manner now proposed. Sir, has the past of the Territory of Kansas faded from the remembrance of the Government organ?

Does it suppose that the people of this nation have forgotten that Governor Reeder was abandoned by the President, because he, like a true man, resisted frauds and outrages upon the ballot-box and the right of free suffrage that were a disgrace to any people on earth? and that he was deprived of power, and a successor appointed to do the bidding of the oppressor. Here was an instance among many, where the exercise of Executive patronage was false to the best interest of those who should have been protected and sustained by the power and influence of a territorial Executive. But no sooner did he manifest a disposition to sustain the people in their legitimate rights, than his place was filled by another; and thus the wrongs against which he struggled were sanctioned, and received the countenance of that power which then held in its hands the destinies of the country. Could this have been done had the people of that Territory elected their own Governor, and he not subject to removal by the President, but firmly fixed in the gubernatorial office and sustained by those who elected him?

But, sir, is the case of Governor Geary also forgotten; a case more palpable than the former? When the Toombs bill, so-called, that had met the approval of the Democratic members of the Senate after its modification by the Committee on Territories, in 1856, by striking out the clause requiring a submission of the constitution that might be formed by virtue of its provisions to the people, for their approval or rejection, had failed to secure a favorable consideration in the House of Representatives, though the entire Democratic party were in favor of it, the same principle was embodied in a bill proposed in the Kansas Legislature providing for the well-known Lecompton convention. In that bill, like its progenitor, the Toombs bill of the Senate, there was no provision requiring the constitution, when formed, to be submitted to a vote of the people. And it was well known that, like its parent, it was designed to produce a constitution that, whatever might be its provisions, was to be enforced upon the people without their assent or the expression of their opinion; which intention of the friends of the Toombs bill is clearly demonstrated by the declarations of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. Toombs) who introduced it. The following is his language. (See Congressional Globe of last session, Appendix, page 127:)

"The principles on which that measure was based were these: first, that all the legal voters of the Territory should have a fair opportunity, free from force or fraud, to elect a convention, and to make a constitution; and then that they should come into the Union under that constitution, without referring either the constitution to the people or the question of admission again to Congress."

Governor Geary, well knowing the wishes and sentiments of the people of Kansas, whose Governor he was, and being well advised that a most gross fraud and outrage was designed to be perpetrated by the action of the convention to be called, vetoed the bill, mainly and almost entirely for the reason that it did not require a submission of the constitution to be formed to a direct vote of the people for confirmation or rejection of those whose constitution it was to be. And yet for this firm adherence to the rights and most reasonable requirements of nine-tenths of the inhabitants of Kansas, he, too, was for that act compelled to relinquish the office of Governor, having thereby incurred the displeasure and the frowns of power.

Why, sir, did the Executive of this great nation of self-governing people interfere with its unrestrained and relentless removing and appointing power to thwart and override the known and acknowledged will of the people? Why simply, sir, to make that free people subservient to the dictation of the then dominant political party, which was bending all its energies to aid in the extension of the institution of slavery over a country whose people abhorred its moral, social, and political effects. And, sir, are these not evils that should be corrected, and are these not reasons that should demand the reform proposed?

Nor does the record of unparalleled Executive outrage stop here. When the Lecompton constitution had been formed, Governor Walker met the full force of Executive displeasure, and was compelled to retire from his official position like his predecessors; not because he warred upon the elective franchise; not because the people demanded his removal; but, sir, because he pledged his word that the people should have an opportunity to vote for or against that

aggregation of frauds and vile political heresies, the Lecompton constitution.

Stanton, the acting Governor of Kansas for a season, having called the Legislature together in order that, through its action, the people might have an opportunity, by a direct vote, to make a record of their will relative to that constitution, was consigned to the new-made grave of those, within the removing power of the President, who dared to assume that the people of a Territory had a right to make and pass upon their own constitution, preparatory to becoming a State.

To propose to remedy this system of aggression upon the rights of every free-man, and an insult to the common sense and common honesty of mankind, by placing the territorial officers within the keeping of the people whose interests are to be effected, and whose rights are to be guarded, by them, is, in the opinion of the President, expressed through his organ, "the suggestion of mere theory regardless of experience, and reckless of practical consequences;" and, from the same Executive, through the same organ, his utter abhorrence of the voting power is declared in the following language:

"We seem always to forget that our system of popular government is an experiment; one that has been often tried in the eventful history of mankind, under circumstances fully as favorable and promising as those which surrounds us, but which has always failed until now. We are but three quarters of a century old in government—a very small portion of the infancy of a nation—and we already have concluded that our success is complete. Nay, in the pride of our overweening confidence, we are presumptuously applying the most severe tests to our institutions; tests which, but for their extraordinary vigor, would already have shattered them to pieces. We cannot imagine a more severe trial to popular institutions than the enactment of laws which do not spring from the exigencies of practical, out-door life, are not called for by any experienced evil, and promises no practical advantage; but are the mere suggestions of abstract theory, the deductions of a crazy idealism working itself into a frenzy of philanthropic innovation, in the closet. This sort of legislation was pursued in France for a few memorable years, and ended in a catastrophe which will astonish and appall mankind to the end of time."

Sir, it is here said that a severe test is to be applied to popular institutions by adopting the "idealism" of extending the voting franchise in the Territories, and that this kind of legislation was pursued in France, and ended in a catastrophe which astonished and will appall mankind until the end of time.

Sir, the elective franchise has ever been the basis of free popular institutions; and its extensions to American citizens, wherever they may be found, in State or Territory, will be the safeguard of liberty, and the assurance of constitutional rights. Sir, it is the test of republican and popular institutions, and that by which their permanency and stability are secured.

It is that element in a Government at the mention of which tyrants tremble, and corrupt executives grow pale: it is that which restricts the appointing power, and prevents the means of the accomplishment of evil and corrupt practices. Why then should not the present Administration fear and tremble at the suggestion of this mode of reformation?

It is said this kind of legislation was tried in France, and produced most appalling results. I admit this kind of legislative policy has appalled some portion of mankind before this. It appalled the minions of King George, and the Tories of the Revolution; it has ever appalled, and ever will appall, the opponents of popular institutions and true republican government, and it appalls the friends of centralization of power. Sir, it is opposed to the sentiment promulgated in the Toombs bill, which contemplated setting on foot a State constitution in Kansas, without reference to the will or wishes of the people, as clearly enunciated in the speech of Senator Toombs that I have referred to and read.

But, Mr. Chairman, this doctrine of the Union is not new; it is the doctrine of the Democratic party, as shown by the extract above referred to, and again fully declared by Senator BIGLER during the last session of Congress, in the discussion upon the bill to admit Kansas as a State into the Union. Referring to the subject of a popular vote, he says:

"I do not pretend to know anything on this subject which may not appear in the Journal of Debates. I shall not hold the Senator to anything that does not appear there; but this I will say, that I was present when that subject was discussed by Senators before the bill was introduced, and the question was raised and discussed whether the constitution, when formed, should be submitted to a vote of the people. It was held by those most intelligent on the sub-

ject, that in view of all the difficulties surrounding that Territory, the danger of any experiment at that time of a popular vote, it would be better that there should be no such provision in the Toombs bill; and it was my understanding, in all the intercourse I had, that that convention would make a constitution and send it here without submitting it to the popular vote."

Here, sir, was a caucus, a meeting of senatorial chiefs of Democracy, solemnly declaring, as party leaders, that the dangerous experiment of a popular vote was not to be tolerated, that the people were not to be trusted. And thus it is ever with power, jealous of its prerogatives, and prating the danger of experiments when liberal political doctrines are proposed. Sir, I am glad the issue is made; I am glad that the robe that has so long concealed the real purposes of the Administration is at last thrown boldly aside, and the doctrine clearly proclaimed that the extension of the voting power is an "*idealism*," a dangerous *experiment*, that should at once be put down by the Democratic power of the nation. This, sir, makes the issue plain; this marks the line between the friends of popular institutions and sycophants of power so plain that no one has a right to be mistaken. The guise that is worn is no longer deceptive. The doctrine of "popular sovereignty," couched in unmeaning generalities, that foisted into power the present Chief Magistrate of the nation, is now thrown by as an over-worn garment, or as an oft-told tale not worthy to be repeated; and now that it is proposed to disrobe it of its deceptive powers, and to give it distinctiveness of character, and make it the real helper of popular institutions and popular rights, it stinks in the nostrils of Democracy, and is denounced as a dangerous innovation upon republican institutions.

Mr. Chairman, these are some of the evils I would correct; this is the doctrine I would see adopted in our territorial policy, not only because it is just and right to the people of the Territories, and one of the vital elements of our free institutions which has been fully tested in the States, and by the very men to whom it is now proposed to extend it in their new homes, and who have lost nothing of their fidelity to the institutions of the country by their emigration, but because it is one of the most fitting and appropriate means to arrest the steady yet rapid onward march of increasing Executive power, in its baleful and corrupting progress.

And, sir, I call on all who, with honest purpose, have professed to be friends of popular sovereignty and popular institutions, to come forward and aid in giving effectiveness of character to a proposition which heretofore has been the instrument only of personal aggrandizement, without one effort to make it practically, and in fact, what it promises to the ear, and to declare themselves for or against this measure.

The next proposition, Mr. Chairman, is, that there shall be donated to every actual settler in the Territory one hundred and sixty acres of public land, on such conditions and under such restrictions as shall secure an actual cultivation and permanent improvement thereof. The object of this provision is to promote a permanent settlement of the Territories by such persons as shall be desirous of uniting their interests with the interests of the country in which they propose to make their homes, and to induce an emigration thither which shall be individual and voluntary in its character, each seeking to advance his own interest by that industry and enterprise that so eminently characterize the prosperous and successful of our fellow-citizens, and to correct, by inducements to industry, many of the evils of the irregular speculative, and transitory character of the emigration to the Territories under the present system of territorial settlement. The object of the Government, doubtless, is to induce the settlement of the public domain by those who will reduce the lands to cultivation, and by the productions of the earth add to the general wealth of the nation—our Government having no interest in the sale or disposition of the public lands at whatever price they may bring, either high or low, unless such sale shall in some manner contribute to the happiness of the people or the wealth of the country, which can only be done by their productive qualities being developed. Should the Government receive millions for her lands from the purchaser, and the lands remain unoccupied, not one dollar would be added to the general wealth, nor one more home for the people be provided; and the only effect would be, that the money would pass into the coffers of the Govern-

ment to be again disbursed, and the land be held by the purchaser as it was before held by the Government. The great object, then, should be, in any policy that may be adopted, to induce the cultivation of the soil and permanent homes for the people.

The Government holds the vast domain, not for its own use or speculative purpose, but for the people of the nation. This has been the object of the Government in its land policy from the commencement of legislative action on that subject. And while it has been productive of good results, yet many evils have crept in to thwart its most cherished purpose; and so complete has become the system of land-jobbers that, at our public land sales, unless the settlers are sufficiently numerous to protect their rights by physical force, they buy, if at all, at the favor and on the conditions prescribed by the bands of speculators who infest the country, and who buy large tracts of land and hold it at prices that prevent the settlement of the country by those who are unable to compete with the moneyed influence and artfully-planned conspiracies of land operators. And the hard-laboring and industrious pioneer is thus, not unfrequently, brought, when least able to protect his rights, in immediate competition with the wealthy speculator and the unprincipled land pirate. I admit that no system will be entirely exempt from the frauds of the designing, but many of the evils that now exist can be avoided.

I then, sir, as one of the means to effect this object, propose a donation of a quarter section of land to the *bona fide* settlers. It will as nearly as any other mode dispose of equally to the whole people the benefits of our vast domain. Owned as it is by the entire country equally, and held for the benefit of the people of each State, it should, with the same equality, be dispensed in its benefits. How better, then, can we accomplish this object than by saying to the people of every portion of the whole country, pointing to our mighty western possessions, with their swelling rivers and rich prairies, with undulating plains and waving forests, smiling a welcome to the husbandman, and promising a rich reward to the toiling—here are homes for the million; this is the patrimony of the people; it is yours; make ye homes and found republics. The enterprising of every portion of the Union who are desirous of bettering their condition by emigration will then have an equal opportunity of drawing from the great store-house of nature an annual reward for the labor they bestow, untrammelled and unrestrained by the influence of capital in the hands of the few, and the monopoly of the landed interest in the old States. Against this proposition no cry of North or South or of sectionalism can be raised. The northern and southern emigrants are promised in the exact same proportion of the Government bounty, requiring in each case only the industry and enterprise of the person to secure the desired results; and in this consists the great leading distinction between the system of donation of lands and the old system of sales. The one makes the public lands the object of individual industry and individual reward, while the other involves the moneyed interests of the country, and is controlled by capital; and to such an extent has this system of land speculation been carried on of late years, that our land system has become a mockery in view of its original intention. And the freehold of the country is held, controlled, and sold, as a matter of trade and commerce by the jobbers and land brokers. Commerce and the manufacturing interests require the agency and power of Capital and Government aid; and to that end does the Government impose protecting duties, and lavish money in the protection of commerce. With this, sir, I find no fault. It is just and right that it should do so to a reasonable extent. So intimately blended are the producing manufacturing, and commercial interests of the country, that a direct aid to one is an indirect aid to the others; and if the producing interest is indirectly benefited by its advancement of the manufacturing and commercial interests, and are hence dependent one upon the other, then a direct aid and expansion of the producing element would be an indirect benefit of the other interests.

Mr. Chairman, the true theory of our Government is, in all practical ways to individualize, and not monopolize, interests. Ours is a Government of individualities, bound together for the mutual benefit and protection of all; and just in proportion as individuals are prosperous, so will be the prosperity of

the nation. And for that reason I propose, so far as the policy of the Government can effect it, to induce every individual, in his own right, to become an owner of the soil. What higher boast could a nation make, than that the people in their own right held the freehold of their homes. It would make them loyal to the Government, for then, in fact, and not in theory alone, would it be their Government. And, sir, who are more worthy to be encouraged than those who are willing to endure the hardships incident to a new country, and to convert the wilderness into fitting abodes and habitations of men? They are a class of people who toil, and who add to the common stock of a nation's wealth; they extend your borders, and defend the frontiers; they pay their proportion of Government burdens equally with the merchant prince of the old States; they fight your battles in the hour of peril, and shrink at no sacrifice in their country's cause. And while you pay an annual bounty of many hundred thousand dollars to the hardy fishermen of New England, and levy duties on articles consumed by them, for the benefit of eastern manufacturers and southern sugar growers, you are asked in vain to permit those whose only capital is their labor, to appropriate, not the Government's land, but the people's own land, to their own individual use and occupation, to make that labor (their capital) available.

Sir, when capital, or pretended capital, concentrates for the purpose of building railroads, and asks for public lands, millions of acres are yearly granted to soulless corporations, with a reckless extravagance that ought to alarm and startle the country; but when the settler asks his own moiety of the common patrimony, that he may build a home for his family, he is told to go buy in the market. And now, sir, to-day, before this Congress, there are being urged grants of lands to railroad companies in the Territories, with a haste and anxiety prompted by the fact that it is daily made more apparent that the wants of actual settlers will demand it for occupation, and thus daily and hourly they are competing for their own with moneyed corporations and the legislation of Congress. Give land to the settler, and you give homes to the honest poor. Give homes to the industrious, and you give security and wealth to the nation, for in the pockets of the people should be found the wealth of the Republic. I would, sir, if in my power, make every quarter section of land in the Territories the habitation of a free man. I would dot it all over with smiling homes, the abodes of comfort. Then, sir, the country would reap a thousand fold the value of her lands. And then, in due time, would spring up the improvements of the age; first, school and church, then town and city, with railroads, commerce, and manufactories in their due proportion, and in each new State would be the elements of an empire. And, sir, it would give security and stability to your political institutions, the land-holder having the means of prosperity within his power, secured to him by the Government, realizes that he is an integral part of it; that her prosperity is his prosperity; that her permanence is his security; and that he has a direct interest in her advancement. He is as jealous of her honor as of his own, and will protect it as surely. And, sir, it is a palpable fact, that in our cities, and proportionably in our towns and county where there are found the most landless persons, where men have no permanent homes, there is found the field of operation of the corrupt and the designing; there the elective franchise is but lightly held; there the demagogue plies his foul work, and there national interests and national honor are the play things of unprincipled politicians.

Look you, sir, to our large cities, where the swaying masses of unlocated life sweep onwards, politically, regardless of anything and everything but their own passions or vile political venality. And each succeeding political campaign shows more clearly the growing danger to our institutions from this element of political power; and hence it is becoming more and more apparent that the permanence of our institutions must, to a very great extent, depend upon the virtue and integrity of our agricultural and country districts, where industry is rewarded, and labor, the great element of wealth and power, is made honorable, and the intelligence and virtue of the people nurtured and promoted. Homes, sir, independent homes, however humble, are the nursing mothers of morality and virtue, and the bulwarks of free republican institu-

tions. Augment them, sir, by the policy of your laws; augment them by the liberality of the Government, until we can proclaim to the nations of the earth that this is a nation of homes. Then you may dismantle your fortresses and disband your armies; save millions to the Government; and return to the original theory of the Republic, that her sure defence is the willing hearts and hands of the people, surer and stronger than the appliances of standing armies, or monuments of masonry which compose our fortifications.

Sir, there are hundreds of thousands in our country, worthy inhabitants, who are laboring from day to day for scanty allowance, barely sufficient to support their families; who are dependent on their labor for sustenance; and who, while adding to the aggregation of wealth in the hands of the rich and intolerant, are sinking their identity in the great mass of dependants that is accumulating in city, town, and county. That class the Government should aid and succor. They, sir, have no agents about these lobbies, urging, with the energy of wealth, high protective duties for their benefit. No rich army contract finds its way to their hands. No well-paid office gladdens the heart of the laborer and his scantily-fed family. He pays a tax on all he consumes, without complaining. Sir, will not the Government extend to him and them the means of adding to her own and their prosperity, by saying: till the land that nature spreads out in boundless quantities before you?

But, Mr. Chairman, there is still another reason that commends itself to my mind. It is the practical protection and protective policy to the great free labor interest of the United States; not to the North or South alone, nor to East or West, but to that element and interest wherever it may be found. It enables it to assert its right to the high position to which it is entitled in the political economy of our Government. Sir, it gives it manhood and vigor; it enables it to declare its own superiority over its great antagonism, slave labor; meets that great question of the day at the threshold, and, by the power of its own intrinsic merit, defies and overthrows it, not by the political organizations and wrangling disputations of party chieftains; not by the power of Executive interference; but by the moral and political power that free labor engenders in the hearts and souls of free men that have known and felt its reward and dignity.

To accomplish this, I would induce emigration from the South, of the free, laboring men of the South, who, by the effects of a land-monopoly system inseparable from the institution of slavery, are landless and dependent, to the Territories, where, with an equal right to the soil, they would, with their own labor, thus honorable, become the molders of their own fortunes; and proud of their own creation, they would spurn the chains that had restrained their energies; and, being now independent, would hate oppression in any form, and would cherish only those institutions which tend to elevate and ennoble mankind. Think you that, in a territory where the laborer and his family are tasting the sweets of the fruits of his own toil, where his own rights are acknowledged, where he teaches his children the precepts of justice and humanity, slavery and oppression can find a safe abode? No, sir; the common sense of mankind responds, it cannot; and if ever the slaveholding States permit this question to be fully met and discussed, its demonstration will be as a light to the path of the laboring man to a land where slavery is not tolerated. Sooner or later, that proposition will call forth the latent energies of the non-slaveholders in the slave States, which, when once aroused, will prove more potent than any agency of a political character, from whatever quarter it may come. Sir, the strong man may be bound for a time, but, ere long, he will break the bands that have bound him, and stand erect in the pride of his own manhood. In this, the North will have no agency; but in the settlement of the common territories of the country, she demands that her teeming population shall bear their just part in the organization and shaping of their moral and political destinies. The twenty million inhabitants of the northern States will send their due proportion of emigration to any new country or territory, wherever it may be opened for settlement, whether in Central America or within the Territories of the United States. Adopt the policy I have indicated, and, in my judgment, slavery would find its only safe habitation within the present slave States.

With this belief, I say to all those who desire the acquisition of more territory, whether it be south or north, if it can be honorably and justly acquired, I have no objections. But, Mr. Chairman, it must be for freedom, and not for slavery; and, in the plan I have proposed, I believe that guarantee is sure. Settle any country with free laborers; give them the means of prosperity, by the exercise of a due degree of energy and industry; and they will abhor slavery, because of its great moral and social wrong. Where the people have made their own homes and erected their own altars; where the father and the son have toiled for their own independence, and, by their success, made glad, happy firesides; where liberty is loved and freedom venerated; there, sir, you may pile mountain high Dred Scott decisions; there you may send your slave code from congressional halls; yet slavery will not be, it cannot live, in such an atmosphere. The people will not resist your laws, but there will be no victims for their vengeance. This is the element that has driven it from many of the States, once slaveholding, but now free; it is the element that is now rearing monuments to mark its power in Missouri, and is the hope of her freedom.

The property element is the most sensitive of any element in our political economy; it shrinks instinctively from the approach of danger; it trembles when political elements are stirred. Men will face danger themselves, but they will not hazard their property. Stocks vibrate at the first symptom of a panic, and go down at the first cry of civil commotion. Think you, then, that the master will trust his slaves where the moral sense of the community is formed by free laboring emigrants of the North and South? I believe not. The planter emigrates but seldom; his movements are tardy; his investments are large; time is required for preparation to emigrate; and like the capitalist of the North, but few compatibly seek new habitations in the early settlement of a country; while the young, the enterprising, and the industrious, non-land and non-slaveholders, flock to the new country to better their condition, and to acquire permanent estates. This is the course of natural ordinary emigration, and any other character of emigration; unnatural in its progress, and not prompted by motives of individual interest, but in the hands of plotting, scheming men, designed to effect some political purpose, or to accomplish some object not for the interest of the masses, subserves no good purpose either to the Territory or country.

But, sir, aside from this result, the policy is a just one; it is the natural offspring of our institutions; it induces a natural, not a forced, emigration; it tends to the elevation of the worthy and industrious; opening avenues of success to the humble yet enterprising citizens, and is in accordance with the true theory and genius of the Constitution and spirit of a free Government; it develops the physical resources of the country and moral power of the people, and induces a high equality, without which a republican Government cannot produce the full measure of the fruits of its mission. And while, in addition to this, it administers a corrective to the doctrine of the extension of slavery, it so much the more commends itself to my approbation.

Are gentlemen wanting in confidence of this result? I would point them to the history of the State of Illinois on the subject of slavery. It will be remembered that, under the operation of the ordinance of 1787, and the action of Congress after the adoption of the Constitution of the United States, slavery was prohibited in all the Northwestern Territory, which included the Territory, now the State, of Illinois. And while it should be admitted that the slaves held by the old French settlers prior to that ordinance, were permitted to be held still as slaves under a claim of treaty stipulations; and while, for the time, the system of indentured servants was adopted, both in violation of the spirit and letter of law, yet so marked was the policy of the Government in relation to that Territory against slavery, that it fixed the character of emigration to that country. The non-landholder and the non-slaveholder rapidly emigrated to Illinois, to avoid an institution that had, in the slave States from which they removed, been ruinous to their interests; while the slaveholders, more slowly, but steadily, emigrated, with their slaves, to Missouri, where slavery was established; and comparatively but few, save slaveholders, located there in the early years of that Territory.

In this manner was fixed the character of emigration by the policy of legislation, which, though different in terms from that now proposed, tended to and contemplated the same results. And this adopted will, in my opinion, produce the same distinctive character of emigration, and result in the same consequences; which are, that while the Territory is equally open, with all its advantages, to every citizen of the United States, irrespective of his location or pursuits, yet, sir, discourages, and, I trust, will prevent the importation of slaves and the institution of slavery, a State institution only, which attaches to the State government, and not to the people personally, into the Government Territories.

The emigration to Illinois, until after the adoption of her State constitution in 1818, and, in fact, until 1825, was, by a large majority, from the slaveholding States; and yet, while many of the leading politicians of that young State were anxious that it should become a slave State, and plied the political machinery under their control to effect that object, yet the very people who had known from practical experience the effect and working of the institution of slavery, both in a social and political view, by a large and decided majority, voted Illinois a free State. And thus, in fact, the emigrants from slave States, having realized and felt the benefits of free institutions in the reward of industry, are now found the advocates of freedom.

The character of emigration to Missouri being different, yet both voluntary and natural, it became a slave State. Afterwards, in 1823, the restless, aspiring politicians, knowing then, as now, the political power of slavery, again agitated the question of adopting the institution of slavery in that State. That could only be done by a change of the State constitution; and, to accomplish this, it was necessary that two-thirds of each branch of the Legislature should concur in a law submitting the proposition of a call of a convention to amend the constitution to the people. This majority was found, and the question submitted, when it was fully and freely discussed; but the laboring people, the masses, who had homes, and a direct interest in the well-being of the country, rose in their strength and again, by a decisive majority, declared against slavery; and thus, I trust, put forever at rest that question in our State. And this is illustrative of a fact which I believe exists; that, while many of the politicians of the country are in favor of slavery, the great mass and heart of the people are opposed to it, and demand its non-extension, and will not be satisfied with the very extraordinary position of the northern Democracy, that the institution of slavery is merely a question of convenience and self-interest; or, in the language of Judge DOUGLAS, in his New Orleans speech, recently delivered, is a matter of climate and interest. He says, speaking of slavery:

“In my opinion, the people will want it, and will have it if their climate and productions are favorable to its profitable use. Consequently, the existence of slavery in a Territory is a question to be determined by climate and necessity and self-interest, and not by congressional legislation.”

To him, and to that part of the Democracy that he represents, the question of slavery extension is a matter of no interest; and of entire indifference to him, or them, whether the Territories of our common country are free or slave.

Sir, this is not the voice and sentiment of the people; they are an affirmative people, as their fathers were, and will not be content much longer, when the question is made by the two great political parties, to fold their arms and say, we have no interest in this great matter. They are beginning to see that it is their duty to range themselves on the one side or the other, and not indirectly throw their political power on the side of slavery extension, when they are at heart opposed to it. This complex and deceptive policy will not survive but a little longer, and when the sentiments of the people shall be made known, and their Representatives fearless of party political consequences, speak and vote them on this floor, the slavery question will be settled in a day.

The next proposition in the resolution offered, is, that the people of a Territory shall provide for and pay the current expenditures of such territorial government.

This proposition seems to be suggested as the natural result or consequence of the two former. Having provided the settler with a generous donation of

land from which to produce an annual return, and which, from the character of our territorial possessions and the fertility of the soil, is realized abundantly the first season of improvement and cultivation, I am unable to see any just reason why the current expenditures of such territorial government should not be borne by its inhabitants, the General Government providing for the erection of public buildings and ordinary public improvements, by appropriations of money or donations of land for that purpose; also, by appropriations of land for school purposes, as has become the settled policy of the Government, making a permanent fund for educational objects, the burden for governmental purposes will certainly not be more enormous than were the same burdens in the States from which they may have removed; and, having the power to elect their own officers and fix the amount of their salaries, they alone will be to blame that the expenses of such government are not restricted to the reasonable governmental wants of the people, in view of their number and localities.

It is true that, under our present system of territorial governments, the expenditures are large and would be burdensome to the people of a sparsely-settled Territory. But, sir, they are unreasonably large. Why, the pay of territorial officers generally, and in fact always, far exceeds the pay of like officers in the States where there is any similarity in the amount of duties to be performed. We pay the Governors in Kansas and Nebraska \$2,500 per annum, and the judges \$2,000, when the same duties, and really twice as much, are performed by like officers in many of the States for a much less amount. Where the offices are eagerly sought after with that remuneration, and the duties thereof discharged with as much ability and fidelity, may we not then assume that the same correction would be made and the same results follow from the action of the people if they had the power in a Territory as in a new State? When they have the control, and are responsible for their action, they will only incur such expenditures as they can reasonably meet and which will be found abundant to carry on their government.

If your constituents ask you, gentlemen, why this difference? answer them truly, and tell them that in one case the people arrange and judge of those matters for themselves with a just regard for the duties to be performed and a reasonable compensation therefor; while in the other, the places are to be filled by the appointees of the party in power, with a view to mold the political character of the new State, and for the further purpose of rewarding political partisans who have been repudiated by the people at the ballot-box; but having done some service for the party, they are taken from the political battle-field from among the dead and dying, by the President, to the great political hospital, the appointing power, and soon find themselves provided for in some well-paid office in a Territory. And, sir, so disastrous have been the political conflicts of late to the Administration, that many new Territories are to be organized to supply the pressing wants of the Executive.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the doctrine and principle of dependencies; and would divest our territorial system of it as much as possible. In Great Britain it serves the purpose of providing for the wants of that portion of the nobility who cannot provide for themselves; in our country it is made a sure retreat for the disappointed political aspirant, or it serves to propitiate some vigorous party leader by the appointment of his retainers. Relieve the people of this policy, give them the choice of their own officers, make these officers accountable to the people who elect them, require the people to assume the responsibility of their own government, and you will assimilate the territorial government to our popular State institutions, and induce in the Territories a vigorous and manly growth. Sir, pursuing this policy, I would be just to the people of the States as well as the Territories, and require that the latter should remain under a territorial form of government until the character of their institutions should be indicated, and until their population should be equal to the number required for one member in Congress under the ratio of congressional representation; so that, when admitted as a State, their political power in the councils of the nation would not be greater than the same number of people in the States.

This policy was clearly indicated in the early days of the Republic, so early

as the organization of the different Territories in the Northwest, then so called. Even when the ratio was thirty thousand, and afterwards thirty-three thousand, there was a provision in the ever-memorable territorial ordinance of 1787, which was applied from time to time to successive new Territories, as follows:

“And whenever any of the said States shall have sixty thousand free inhabitants therein, such State shall be admitted, by its Delegates, into the Congress of the United States, on an equal footing with the original States: *Provided*, The constitution and government so to be formed shall be republican and in conformity to the principles contained in these articles; and so far as it can be consistent with the general interests of the Confederacy, such admission shall be allowed at an earlier period, and when there may be a less number of inhabitants in the State than sixty thousand.”

Thus clearly indicating the opinions and policy of the men of that age, yet providing for an exception to the general rule, if any contingency should arise that might seem to require it.

The reason for naming that number doubtless was the belief that, in the then ordinary course of emigration and settlement of a new country, sufficient time would elapse before that number would be reached to give permanency to the settlements, and, at the same time, a clear right to the people to congressional representation by the number of inhabitants. And this policy does not seem to have been departed from but in a very few instances, as will appear from the following statement, believed to be correct:

Population of the several States, the ratio of representation, and the number of Representatives allowed to each at the time of their admission respectively.

States.	When admitted.	Population.	Ratio of Representation at time of admission.	Represent's before next apportionment.
New Hampshire.....	June 21, 1788	141,899	3
Massachusetts.....	Feb. 6, 1788	378,717	8
Rhode Island.....	May 29, 1790	69,110	1
Connecticut.....	Jan. 9, 1788	238,141	5
New York.....	July 26, 1788	340,120	6
New Jersey.....	Dec. 18, 1787	184,139	4
Pennsylvania ..	Dec. 12, 1787	434,373	8
Delaware.....	Dec. 7, 1787	59,096	1
Maryland.....	April 28, 1788	319,728	6
Virginia.....	June 20, 1788	723,200	10
North Carolina.....	Nov. 21, 1789	393,751	5
South Carolina.....	May 23, 1788	249,073	5
Georgia.....	Jan. 2, 1788	82,548	3
Vermont.....	March 4, 1791	85,539	2
Kentucky.....	June 1, 1792	73,077	2
Tennessee.....	June 1, 1796	77,262	33,000	1
Ohio.....	Nov. 29, 1802	41,915	33,000	1
Louisiana.....	April 8, 1812	76,556	33,000	1
Indiana.....	Dec. 11, 1816	63,897	25,000	1
Mississippi.....	Dec. 10, 1817	75,512	35,000	1
Illinois.....	Dec. 3, 1818	34,620	35,000	1
Alabama.....	Dec. 14, 1819	144,317	35,000	1
Maine.....	May 15, 1820	298,335	35,000	7
Missouri.....	Aug. 10, 1821	66,580	35,000	1
Arkansas.....	June 15, 1836	52,240	47,000	1
Michigan.....	Jan. 26, 1837	200,000	47,000	1
Florida.....	March 3, 1845	54,477	70,680	1
Texas.....	Dec. 29, 1845	250,000	70,680	2
Iowa.....	Dec. 28, 1846	81,920	70,680	2
Wisconsin.....	May 29, 1848	210,596	70,680	2
California.....	Sept. 9, 1850	107,000	70,680	2
Minnesota.....	May 11, 1858	136,464	93,420	2

And in the instances that seem to have been exceptions to the general rule, which are but three, (Illinois, Arkansas, and Florida,) Arkansas had largely over the number then required for one member in Congress. Illinois, at the

time of her admission, lacked three hundred and eighty only of the ratio of representation then established; and Florida numbered fifty-four thousand four hundred and seventy-seven inhabitants when admitted; yet the congressional ratio was then seventy thousand six hundred and eighty. Thus in one instance only has there been really a substantial departure from the rule requiring a sufficient number of inhabitants for one Representative. The reason for this exception might have been as marked then for Florida, as it now is believed to be for Kansas; all of which reasons for exceptional cases would be avoided by the proposed change of policy. And I may here assume, that at the present time, one hundred thousand will become permanent inhabitants of a Territory, as soon as would sixty thousand at the time that number was adopted as the rule. It is certain that equality of representation and political power can alone be secured but by adhering to the general rule; and it should not be departed from only where the reasons for such departure are clear and manifest.

Mr. Chairman, I have but little expectation that these propositions will meet with favor from those in power; but, sir, they will commend themselves to the common sense and honest judgment of the people; and whether they are adopted by this House now, or not, the time is not far distant when our constituents will require their enactment.

The following is the resolution offered by Mr. Kellogg, in relation to the Government of the Territories:

Resolved, That the Committee on Territories be instructed to report to this House a bill that shall embrace all the organized Territories of the United States, providing for the election by the people of all Territorial officers now appointed by the President, except in the Territory of Utah." Also, "providing for the donation of one hundred and sixty acres of Government land to every actual settler thereon within any of said Territories, under such regulations and restrictions as shall secure an actual and bona fide occupation, and permanent improvement thereof; the title thereof to be transferred to said occupant at such time and on such conditions as the committee may deem advisable to secure the permanent settlement and improvement of said lands; and that no person shall be entitled to receive from the Government more than one donation of land under the provisions of said bill. Also providing that the inhabitants of each of said Territories shall provide for and pay the current expenses of such Territorial Government. And also providing that the inhabitants of said Territories shall remain in a Territorial form of Government until the inhabitants of a Territory shall be equal to the number required for one Representative under the ratio of Congressional representation. And that the people of any of said Territories, who may desire to establish a State Government, having the requisite number of inhabitants, and having formed a Constitution for such State Government, shall cause the same to be submitted to a fair vote of the legal voters of such Territory, for approval or rejection."

Printed by Lemuel Towers.